

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

1. In the Examiner's Office Communication dated February 20, 2007, Examiner indicated that claim 11 was allowed and that claims 12, 13, 15, 18-20, 22 and 23 were rejected. However, Examiner indicated that claims 14, 16 and 17 were objected to as being dependant upon a rejected claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Examiner stated that such rewritten claims would be allowable on the basis that each would recite that the electrode is formed of a plurality of hexagonal elements which would patentably distinguish those claims over JP'472.
2. In accordance with Examiner's direction, claim 14 has been cancelled and claim 12 of the application has been amended to provide that the electrode layer comprises a plurality of discreet elements that have a regular hexagonal shape and that the discreet elements form a pattern comprising a honeycomb array of elements. It is respectfully submitted that claim 12 as amended now meets Examiner's requirements for allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 12 and dependant claim 13 should be allowed.
3. In accordance with Examiner's direction, claim 16 has been cancelled and claim 15 has been amended to provide that the discreet polygonal elements are hexagonal in shape. Claim 17 has been amended to now depend from amended claim 15. It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 15 now meets Examiner's requirements for allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 15 and dependant claims 17-20 and 22-23 thereto should now be allowed.
4. Examiner indicated that the previous amendment to claim 22 was not in the proper format because a double bracket or strikethrough was not used but rather a single bracket. However,

Examiner indicated that if another copy of the claims were to be submitted, a clean copy of claim 22 with the status identifier previously presented, would be accepted. A clean copy of claim 22 is presented with the current response with the identifier previously presented in accordance with Examiner's instructions.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Zheng Tang

By: _____

Simon R. Foxcroft (Reg. No. 56,279)

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

CUSTOMER NO. 22828